DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 721 UD 022 074

AUTHOR McConahay, John B.
TITLE Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume III: A Proposed National Study of School Desegregation.
INSTITUTION Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn. Center for Education and Human Development Policy.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.; Office of Civil Rights (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 81
CONTRACT NIE-R-79-0034
NOTE 36p.; For other volumes of this Assessment Project see UD 021 862 and UD 022 073-080.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Tests; Attitude Measures; Case Studies; Community Attitudes; *Desegregation Effects; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Interviews; Media Research; Parent Attitudes; Racial Attitudes; *Research Design; *Research Methodology; Research Proposals; Residential Patterns; *School Desegregation; Student Attitudes; Surveys; United States History; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This volume offers a proposal for a national desegregation study which would involve coordinated case studies of twelve to fifteen cities in which there has been substantial systemwide desegregation for 5 to 10 or more years. The following are identified as the principal components of the study: (1) a natural history of school desegregation; (2) a study of housing patterns and markets; (3) a content analysis of media coverage of desegregation; (4) achievement and attitude testing of fifth and tenth grade students in selected schools; and (5) a public opinion survey of adults (parents and non-parents) residing in each city. Also identified are the theoretically and methodologically important evaluation criteria and external validity criteria used in the selection of cities. Each component is justified in a definition of its purpose, and a brief description of the method recommended for data gathering in each area is given. Persons or groups of persons for research of each component are suggested. A time schedule and estimated budget for the project is appended. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212721

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION STRATEGIES

VOLUME III

A PROPOSED NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

John B. McConahay

Center for Education and Human Development Policy
Institute for Public Policy Studies
Vanderbilt University

April 1981

UD 022 074

Preface

This volume is one of nine resulting from the Assessment of Effective Desegregation Strategies Project (hereafter referred to as the Project). The Project was financed with funds provided by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education and administered by the National Institute of Education (NIE).

The primary purpose of the Project has been to identify what is known about strategies that are effective in desegregating school systems. A secondary objective of the Project is to facilitate further research on this topic. The Project will be successful if policy makers and practitioners use its findings, and the subsequent knowledge from research to which the project contributes, to more effectively racially desegregate the nation's schools.

There are several potential goals of desegregation and these may be the terms in which effectiveness is measured. This Project defined an effective strategy in one of four general ways:

1. The acceptance and support of desegregation by parents and the community.
2. The reduction of racial isolation and the avoidance of segregation among public schools (white flight and nonentry) and within schools (unnecessary ability grouping, push-outs, etc.).
3. The development or better race relations among students.
4. The improvement, or at least the continuance, of academic achievement.

The Project involved several different but interrelated activities:

1. A comprehensive review of the empirical research (see Volume V).

2. A review of the qualitative literature on school desegregation, including studies surveying the opinions of practitioners and policy makers (see Volume VI).
3. An analysis of ten key court decisions (see Volume VII).
4. Interviews with local and national experts on school desegregation (see Volume VII).
5. A synthesis of the information gathered in activities 1-4 (see Volume I).
6. A review of actions by state governments and interviews with state officials (see Volume VIII).
7. An agenda for future research to determine the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies (see Volume II).
8. The design of a multicommunity study to determine the factors that account for the effectiveness of school desegregation.
9. A guide to resources that those charged with implementing desegregation might find helpful (see Volume IV).
10. A comprehensive bibliography of books, articles, papers, documents and reports that deal with desegregation strategies related to the four general goals outlined above (see Volume IX).

These several activities were conducted by a team of researchers from several universities and organizations. The Project, which was managed by Willis D. Hawley with the assistance of William Trent and Marilyn Zlotnik, was initially based at Duke University's Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs. Midway during its 19 month life, the Project was moved to Vanderbilt University's Institute for Public Policy Studies. The

members of the Project team were:*

Carol Andersen	Education Commission of the States
C. Anthony Broh	Duke University
Robert L. Crain	Johns Hopkins University, The Rand Corporation
Ricardo Fernandez	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Willis D. Hawley	Vanderbilt University
Rita E. Mahard	University of Michigan, The Rand Corporation
John B. McConahay	Duke University
Christine H. Rossell	Boston University
William Sampson	Northwestern University
Janet W. Schofield	University of Pittsburgh
Mark A. Smylie	Vanderbilt University
Rachel Tompkins	Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools
William Trent	Vanderbilt University
Charles B. Vergon	University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Meyer Weinberg	University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Ben Williams	Education Commission of the States

The conclusions reached in the several volumes are those of the named authors. Neither the NIE or OCR necessarily supports the findings of this Project.

* Affiliations are for the period during which these persons participated in the study.

A PROPOSED NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Principal Questions Addressed by this Study	3
Overview of Proposed Study	6
The Natural Histories Component	13
Housing Analysis Component	20
Media Content Analysis Component	21
Student Quantitative Data	23
Community Opinion Data	25
Time Sequencing	28
Estimated Budget	29
Reference Notes	30

A PROPOSED NATIONAL STUDY OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

John B. McConahay

Introduction

The purpose of this part of the project is to describe the design of a substantial field study. The general purpose of this study is to fill in the important gaps in our knowledge of the school desegregation processes and implementation practices identified by other phases of this project and by interviews conducted by the author with researchers and public officials. The budget figure mentioned for this study was somewhere around one million dollars--a substantial figure, but not one permitting us to answer all the questions or settle all the school desegregation issues. Hence, not every interesting issue can be addressed.

Historical Context

The proposed field study--essentially a series of coordinated case studies--comes during a period when public schools are reported in the media as being failures or as being in a crisis of violence and ineffectiveness. Voucher and tax deduction or credit plans for private schools appear to be gaining greater attention (if not greater support) than ever before and the general public seems to be increasingly resistant to school desegregation. Among whites there has always been a hard core of overt or covert racism motivating their resistance to desegregation. Now, resistance gains additional support from those who believe that desegregation harms education, is not worth the effort and/or is intended as punishment of contemporary white children for alledged sins of their parents. Many black, Hispanic and other minorities are becoming increasingly concerned that desegregation reduces racial isolation at a

considerable and inequitable cost to them without improving the quality of education their children are receiving.

Furthermore, desegregation in the future will be less likely to involve only blacks and whites. Desegregation will become increasingly a tri- or multi-ethnic process as the need to reduce the isolation of Hispanic and other ethnic and cultural minorities is addressed. The successful and educationally effective implementation of this new multi-ethnic desegregation will present stiff challenges.

Goals of Desegregation

It is no secret that those supporting desegregation can be divided into two groups: 1) those who see school desegregation as a terminal value, a constitutional right, an end in itself and 2) those who regard desegregation as an instrumental value, a means to some other end. Usually that end is a quality education for minorities or for all public school students, but other ends mentioned are prejudice reduction, integration of the larger society, educational reform generally or renewal and rejuvination of urban life. Those two ways of valuing school desegregation need not conflict with one another, though frequently their partisans act as if they do. Therefore, so that there will be no doubt that this proposal has both types of values as objective, the two will be arbitrarily assigned different terms. Desegregation as an end in itself will be called "successful desegregation" to the extent that racial and ethnic interaction is maximized and confusion, disruption and resistance is minimized. Desegregation as a means will be termed "effective desegregation" to the extent that it improves the educational experience and academic performance of all students--especially minority students.[1]

Principal Questions Addressed by the Study

The overall goal of this field study is to develop knowledge to assist us in producing successful and effective school desegregation. The "Research Agenda" document details a myriad of specific questions--most of them researchable within the framework of this design. However, the design emerged in its present form because there were five intermediate level questions which achieved a remarkable consensus among the experts as being important to answer if school desegregation was to be effectively and successfully implemented in the next five to ten years.[2] These will be summarized in this section.

How are Housing Patterns and Markets Affected?

The greatest consensus among the experts was that we need to know more about the effects of school desegregation upon housing markets and neighborhood racial composition. We know that in a school system based upon neighborhood attendance zones, segregated housing will produce segregated schools. The segregation can be both on the basis of race or ethnicity and social class. What happens when school attendance is made relatively independent of the neighborhood? We have some very interesting speculations, but little scientifically valid data. The long term effects upon housing may reduce (or increase) resistance to desegregation, thus affecting its chances for success. And, the re-allocation of economic and social resources might also affect the educational effectiveness of school desegregation.

How Does Multi-Ethnic Desegregation Differ from Bi-ethnic?

As indicated above, multi-ethnic desegregation will become increasingly common in the future. Whatever else one might predict in this regard, the safest prediction is that it will make the process more complicated. Those practices or organizational structures that made

bi-ethnic desegregation effective in a given instance might be ineffective or counterproductive in the multi-ethnic situation. New strategies devised for multi-ethnic desegregation might be adopted by school officials in a continuing biethnic situation in order to increase effectiveness there as well. At present, however, little comparative research of this sort has been done.

What Structural Adaptations Have Been Successful and/or Effective?

There is something of a consensus among the experts that we need to know more about the effects of desegregation upon the structural/organization/aspect of school systems. We know a little about the effects of desegregation upon the students' cognitive and attitudinal development, but how school systems adapt and which adaptations are successful and effective are virtually unknown. For example, how does desegregation affect curriculum and which among the various curriculum changes were effective? How has desegregation affected financial support for the schools? What have schools done to increase revenues or to adapt to decreased revenues? What are the major obstacles to the effective and efficient implementation of promising desegregation strategies?

What are the Effects of Resegregation upon the Effectiveness of Desegregation?

Concern for resegregation is likely to increase. Resegregation has three specific aspects: 1) segregating students inside desegregated schools by tracking or career goal grouping, etc., 2) desegregated schools which become resegregated when housing patterns change, and 3) white flight from central city schools to private schools to the suburbs. White flight has been studied a great deal, but the other two aspects of resegregation have not. Resegregation limits the success of desegregation by

definition: students who are resegregated cannot interact. However, there may be instances--especially in multi-ethnic situations--where resegregation within the school for part of the day increases educational effectiveness. This is an empirical question which cannot be answered without further research.

How Does the News Media Affect the Success of School Desegregation?

Many of the experts were quite concerned about the role played by the news media in mobilizing resistance to desegregation. For several years a standard story line in both the print and electronic media has been that busing has failed and desegregation does not work. While one should not overestimate the media as a source of resistance, two aspects of the media and desegregation have not been studied and will be addressed in this proposed study: 1) the role or the effect of the media upon the success of system-wide school desegregation, and 2) what practices or strategies can be used to enlist the support of the media before and during the course of school desegregation.

In addition to the above five research questions, the proposed study design can serve two other purposes.

First, in an attempt to limit white flight and to restore equity, many plaintiffs and desegregation experts have pushed for metropolitan plans that include both central city and the suburbs. Though the courts have resisted these plans except in very special and limited cases, there is a consensus that we need to know more about how metro plans work, how they affect education and how they relate to resegregation. If at least one or two of the cities chosen for study has a metropolitan plan, then we can obtain detailed knowledge of how such plans are working.

Second, though they would agree that not all of the resistance to desegregation stems from lack of knowledge (see above), many of the experts think that the public needs to know about instances in which school desegregation has been successful and/or effective. Hence, if such instances are found, this study can be used to develop, in a systematic and rigorous fashion, qualitative data that can be used to tell the story of successful school desegregation experiences and educationally effective school desegregation practices.

Overview of Proposed Study

It is proposed that the Office of Civil Rights make funds available for a series of coordinated case studies in twelve to fifteen cities in which there has been substantial system-wide desegregation for five to ten or more years. In each of these twelve to fifteen cities, there will be five principal components to the case study: 1) a natural history of school desegregation, 2) a study of housing patterns and markets, 3) a content analysis of media coverage of desegregation and of education generally, 4) achievement and attitude testing of fifth and tenth grade students in selected schools, and 5) a public opinion survey of adults (parents and non-parents) residing in the twelve to fifteen cities. Various options for these components will be discussed in detail below.

What is proposed is a series of coordinated or parallel case studies across the twelve to fifteen cities. This is not a proposal for an aggregate level statistical analysis of the effects of certain variables upon certain other variables across the fifteen cities. An aggregate level analysis, such as has been done in various white flight studies, would concentrate on only one of the components (e.g. housing markets) and have as large a sample of cities as was possible (e.g. the 100 largest

cities) so that mathematical (statistical) controls could be introduced to limit the effects of "nusance" variables (e.g. median income of city) upon the variables of "interest" (e.g. type of busing plan and housing patterns). To repeat, that type of study is not being proposed.

To illustrate what is being proposed, imagine an in-depth case study of one town with a desegregated school system in which a team of political or other social scientists interviewed school officials, parties to the desegregation litigation, and leaders of various formal and informal organizations, made observations in the schools, and wrote a natural history of school desegregation in that town. At the same time, a team of economists or demographers analyzed the housing markets and neighborhood segregation patterns and a team of media experts content analyzed the media coverage of desegregation. Finally, while this was going on, other social scientists tested the students and scientifically sampled public opinions. When the results of these various components were compiled, the final study would tell us a great deal about that town's experience with school desegregation. It would address a number of the important issues, but the question would arise concerning the extent to which these findings could be generalized to other towns and other systems. What is being proposed here is that such a study be replicated twelve to fifteen times in cities with substantial desegregation experience. The data collection methods and research questions asked in each city would be coordinated so as to be comparable across cities (eliminating one of the major problems in aggregating most case studies) while the cities would be chosen by criteria that would allow us to assess the generalizability of the findings.

The principal investigator (PI) for one of the components (e.g. media content) might also turn his or her study into a rigorous aggregate level analysis, but that would be a separate (though quite complementary) project.

Organization and Structure of the Project Team

There are a number of ways in which responsibilities for the field study could be organized and what is proposed here need not be rigidly adhered to. It seems advisable, however, to have a board of overseers or advisors which is distinct from the actual researchers or PI's.

The researchers could be organized with one chief PI responsible for overall design. This person could then subcontract the various components. An alternative would be for a team of PI's with skills in the methods required for the six components to serve as co-principal investigators. The responsibility for the details of design, coordination and hypothesis testing would rest with them.

The board of overseers would serve three purposes: 1) to give credibility to the findings that would extend beyond just the desegregation research community, 2) to remind the PI's of the bigger picture so that the PI's do not get absorbed in the technical details of their craft and go off on a tangent, and 3) to play a major role in deciding the criteria for choosing the twelve to fifteen cities and then to play a major role in choosing which cities should be studied.

With the PI's as ex officio members, the board of overseers should consist of the following:

1. Representatives of the legal community (judges, attorneys),
2. Representatives of the minority community,
3. Representatives of government,

4. Representatives of public education,

5. Prominent social scientists.

The numbers and proportions of the above representatives on the board should be worked out by the PI's and OCR.

Criteria for Choosing Cities

An essential criterion for choosing a city or school system for study is that it must have had substantial (as opposed to token) school desegregation for five to ten or more years. With that exception, however, most of the other criteria discussed here should be regarded as negotiable. They should be on the agenda for discussion by the PI's and board of overseers, but the final decision should rest with them.

These criteria may be divided into three general (though not mutually exclusive) categories: 1) those that are theoretically important, 2) those that are methodologically important, and 3) those that are important for external validity or generalizability. These types of criteria will be discussed in that order.

Theoretically important criteria. Though virtually every criterion discussed in this proposal has some potential theoretical importance, the three discussed in this section are here because they help the study address one of the five principal questions the experts thought the study should address (see above) or they deal with practices over which planners and policymakers have some control.

Though this might conflict somewhat with the criterion that the cities have five or more years of experience with desegregation, at least four of the cities chosen should be tri- or multi-ethnic in composition and in the nature of their desegregation plans. Factors to consider are

the percent of each ethnic group (minority and majority) at the time of implementation and the stability of the population mix. If one of the cities has a rapidly changing ethnic mix, then others should be more stable. Because it is necessary to address one of the five principal questions of this proposed study, this criterion should be considered virtually non-negotiable.

A second (virtually non-negotiable) theoretically important criterion would be to include some cities in which the school system or pro-desegregation private groups had made an effort to enlist the support of the local media for the school desegregation effort. (Other terms that might have been used to describe this criterion in addition to "enlist the support of the media" are co-opt or manipulate the media or put on a program of public relations and education.) To the extent that such efforts have been made, their success with the media and general public can be compared with cities in which no effort was made.

A third theoretically important criterion is the type of desegregation plan instituted. Those drawing up nonvoluntary desegregation plans (nonvoluntary from the perspective of the student/parent that is), generally have two options: 1) school pairing as in the so-called Princeton plans, and 2) rotary or random assignment type plan as in Louisville. A voluntary plan (from the student/parent perspective) often cited is that of Milwaukee. Since those designing the plans have some discretion concerning the type of plan used and good theoretical arguments can be made for each plan (see Volume I of this report, Strategies for Effective Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings), type of plan among the twelve to fifteen to be studied will give empirical data for further evaluations of the plans.

Though not as important as the other three theoretically important criteria, serious consideration should be given to including one or more of the cities with a metropolitan desegregation plan. The experts were quite sure metro desegregation would be an important issue in the 1980s. By analyzing in depth several systems with metro plans, this project can gain knowledge which will be helpful to other systems contemplating such plans and raise the general level of the debate above its current level of unsubstantiated claims and assertions.

Methodologically important criteria. There is really only one methodologically important criterion, though it has three important aspects. This criterion is the availability of quantitative (or quantifiable) data for the city and/or school system from before desegregation or at least from the year of implementation. There are three important sources of these data. One is achievement tests and attitude measures for students. The second is survey or other opinion poll data on community attitudes toward desegregation and public education in general. The third is an archive of local newspapers and maybe even of local television coverage over the years (though this latter is highly unlikely). Not every city included in the study needs to have all these sources of data. Many cities, however, have one or more of them. Riverside, California, for example, has the most extensive student attitude and achievement data available on it and many other university towns have opinion poll data. Furthermore, most towns with a decent public library have an archive of the local newspapers.

It is important to take the availability of these data into account when choosing cities because most of the natural history data will be

based upon retrospective interviews. Comparing these data with data generated by the proposed study will give the study a time dimension that other studies do not have.

External validity criteria. This series of case studies is intended to be a series of replications using methods that are as comparable as possible. To use an unlikely example, if a finding were replicated 15 times across the cities, we would have great confidence in its validity and our confidence would be increased considerably if the 15 cities were heterogeneous on as many dimensions as possible. With only 12 to 15 cities, there cannot be maximum variance on every dimension. Hence, the PI's and the board of overseers must decide which dimension must be maximally heterogeneous. Below is a list of the factors that should be considered in making these decisions:

1. Size and location of city
    a. Large city v. medium size v. small
    b. Geographic region of country (sample all regions of country)
2. Political and socio-economic characteristics
    a. Composition of minority community
    b. Composition of white community
    c. Ethnic composition of white community
3. Extent of busing
    a. Number of pupils bused
    b. Total miles per student
    c. One-way v. two-way
4. Source of desegregation order

a. Court

b. Federal or state government officials

c. Local action

5. Level of community conflict

a. Statements by officials

b. Protests (organized and spontaneous)

c. Boycotts

d. Individual acts of violence (one or two crazies).

These criteria are important for generalizability. The list could be made longer, of course, but these are probably the most important criteria to consider and should be on any agenda for discussion by the PI's and board of overseers. We turn now to a more detailed examination of the five components of the case study in each of the cities.

The Natural Histories Component

The natural history component is the most expensive and the most important of the five components. Therefore, it will be discussed first and in most detail.

Purpose

The natural history component will in a sense address all of the five questions and concerns of the overall field study, but will especially address the questions of multi-ethnic desegregation, resegregation and school system structural adaptation. Furthermore, if some of the cities being studied have metro desegregation plans, it will address that issue as well. Finally, it will provide most of the qualitative raw material for telling the stories of successful and effective desegregation experiences.

Many cities have a smooth desegregation experience and never make it big in the news media. Others have trouble at first and get a great deal of attention. As a result, the public thinks that desegregation generally results in protest, chaos and confusion and that the cities which did have trouble are still experiencing trouble years later. One of the primary purposes of the natural histories will be to tell the stories of what happened in these cities. They would draw upon data from other components of the field study and would have some quantitative data, but most of the natural history of a given city would be in plain English understandable by most people who would take the trouble to read it. It is hoped that this will help lessen the confusion regarding what happens during desegregation and establish the fact that school desegregation can reform and renew public education at the same time that it is ending (or reducing) racial isolation. Of course, if no instances of successful and effective desegregation are found, that is important to know also.

The natural histories will tell the stories of desegregation, but at the same time, this component has an analytic purpose. Officials will be interviewed and teachers, principals and schools will be observed in order to analyze how policies set at the top get implemented as they move toward the classroom. For example, what is the principal's role in preventing or encouraging resegregation in the school or classroom? Why do some desegregated schools in the district have discipline or morale problems while others in the same district do not? Why are some more effective educationally than might be expected while others are not? What has been the effect of school desegregation upon financial support for local education? The researchers will get the answers of public officials to these questions, but they will also make direct observations, read

documents, and check historical records. For example, the school superintendant might assert that desegregation had seriously reduced public financial support for the schools while a check of the records revealed that school bond referenda had failed five times in the six years before desegregation. Hence, it is unlikely that desegregation was responsible for decreased financial support in the district.

Methods

The usual method for doing a natural history of a social or political process is to interview those most involved or affected by the events and to buttress these data with census figures, news media accounts and documentary records. A major part of this component of the field study will utilize the same approach. But in addition, schools and classrooms will be observed directly and use will be made of the data generated by other components of the study.

Interviews. At a minimum, interviews will be conducted with the following groups of people: 1) plaintiffs and their lawyers, 2) school board members, school officials and defense lawyers, 3) judges and their clerks, 4) monitoring commission members, 5) leaders of anti-busing (or anti-desegregation) groups, 6) leaders of minority interest groups, 7) present school officials and board members (if different from those at the time of implementation) and school principals, and 8) business community and other power structure leaders, prominent clergy, parents active in the PTA or other education groups and media personnel.

At the outset, the interview structures, the format of the questions, and the topics to be covered will be standard across all of the cities. However, this is not intended to rule out further probing and inquiry regarding issues and events unique to each city.

Topics. The exact subject matter of the interviews will vary depending upon the person being interviewed, but at a minimum the following topics should be covered by the sum of the interviews:

1. What was done to prepare principals, teachers, students, the community, etc. for desegregation?
2. What was done (is being done) to prevent resegregation within schools, within classrooms and across schools? If nothing is being done, what are academic effects of resegregation?
3. What curricular changes were made? How are they being updated? Were some more effective than others?
4. How were the media dealt with? Were positive measures adopted or was everything done in reaction to the media or events portrayed in the media?
5. If part of a metro plan, were administrative structures and staffs merged?
6. How was public (financial) support for public education affected?
7. What strategies were adopted to make schools effective educationally? In what schools were they implemented? What are the assessments of these strategies?

Documents. The researchers will consult public and private documents, memos, budgets, media accounts, and any other documentary material that can be acquired legally or ethically.

Direct observations. On the basis of the interviews, a number of schools will be chosen for direct observation. The number suggested is four elementary and four high schools or junior high schools. The exact number will depend upon the size of the system and upon the needs of those

doing the student testing (see below). In some systems, the schools might be chosen at random or at random within certain clusters of characteristics (e.g. randomly select two of the ten alledgedly most effective elementary schools and two of those ten judged least effective).

The schools might be chosen because some have particularly good and bad race relations, or because some are outstanding academically and others are not, or because the principals at some followed school district policies to the letter and others deviated. It should be noted, however, that the same strategy for choosing schools should be used in each city.

In the schools and classrooms chosen, student, teacher and principal behavior will be observed in order to validate (or invalidate) what was learned in the interviews and in order to gain direct knowledge of just what is happening in those schools even though it was not picked up in the interviews. Attention will be paid especially to resegregation, to racial interactions, to inservice activities, and to teacher practices.

Core variables to be recorded and coded. Though the analysis of some (or a great many) of these data might be left for secondary analysis by future researchers, it would be the responsibility of the natural history component PI and the study team to record and code the data on the Core Variables in Desegregation Research identified in Table I of An Agenda for Further Research on Desegregation Strategies (Volume II of this report). For convenience, that table of core variables is reproduced below.

TABLE I

Core Variables in the Study of Desegregation

Studies on the effects of different kinds of school desegregation efforts should ideally cover the following topics:

1. Who has been desegregated with whom?
   a. Racial/ethnic mix
   b. Social class of each group
   c. Degree of tracking

2. What was the process of desegregation?
   a. How desegregation came about (court ordered, voluntary, etc.)
   b. Duration of desegregation
   c. Amount of conflict
   d. Amount of community preparation
   e. Amount and type of in-school work with students on racial issues

3. What are the characteristics of the schools and classrooms being studied? While the list of school characteristics that might be studied is long, the number of factors which have been linked to student outcomes is much shorter. They include:
   a. Type of teacher inservice program
   b. Staff attitudes related to race
   c. Staff racial/ethnic composition
   d. Type of instruction; time on task for particular topics; nature of reward systems; opportunities for interracial interaction
   e. Type and extent of extracurricular activities
   f. Type and extent of remedial programs or special programs
   g. School suspensions and discipline policy
   h. Race of individual teachers (for classroom level studies)
   i. Experience of staff in desegregated settings
   j. School size and staff-student ratio
   k. The leadership role and style of the principal
   l. Parental involvement

4. What are individual characteristics of the students being studied?
   a. Sex
   b. Race
   c. Age
   d. Age of first desegregated experience
   e. Years in desegregated school
   f. Capacity for academic achievement
   g. Interracial contact outside of school

5. What are the characteristics of the community in which school desegregation is taking place?
   a. Racially relevant history (including region)
   b. Information level and schools

c. Racial composition
d. Role of community leaders
e. Degree of SES heterogeneity
f. Economic vitality

6. When achievement studies focusing on individuals is part of the research, what is the student's family background?
   a. Learning resources available
   b. Educational backgound of parents
   c. Level of support for achievement (or other student objectives)

7. Student outcomes:
   a. Achievement
   b. Racial attitudes
   c. Racial behavior
   d. Sense of self-confidence, attribution of personal causation
   e. Student victimization

8. Outcomes for Alumni:
   a. College attendance, field chosen, completion
   b. Job-hunting process
   c. Racial contacts
   d. Housing choices
   e. Political participation

9. School System Outcomes:
   a. New innovations
   b. Changes in administration
   c. Parent pressure on schools
   d. School board election outcomes
   e. Tax and bond referenda outcomes

10. Community Outcomes:
   a. Racial controversy over school issues
   b. Racial initiatives in non-school areas
   c. Desegregation in housing
   d. Impact of racial issues in non-school elections.

Who Would Do the Research?

The PI's and the interviewers and data gatherers for the natural history component might come from a number of disciplines practicing research in this tradition: anthropology, history, journalism, education, sociology, political science or community psychology, to name the most obvious. A team incorporating someone with writing skills (such as a journalist who has spent considerable time on the desegregation beat) and

someone with social science interviewing and observational skills might be the best. The school and classroom observations could be done by a graduate student in education, political science, or anthropology. Because of the analytic purposes of the study, the ideal overall PI for this component probably should be a political scientist with training in public policy and extensive knowledge of public education.

Housing Analysis Component

As indicated above, the experts were nearly unanimous in their concern for more data about the effects of desegregation upon housing patterns and markets. We know that there is a high degree of segregation in housing, that desegregated neighborhoods are usually neighborhoods in transition from all one race to all of another, that discrimination in sales and rentals to minorities (especially blacks) still exists, and that there are two housing markets in many parts of the country so that blacks must pay more than whites for the same quality of housing. The potential exists, however, for school desegregation to change this dismal set of facts. Therefore, the housing analysis component is essential to the proposed field study.

Purpose

The purpose of this component is to find out what happened to housing patterns in the twelve to fifteen cities. Questions to be answered would include: Does school desegregation reduce the degree of segregation in housing? Are neighborhood racial compositions stabilized? Is the difference between the two housing markets reduced? What is the time lag or time sequence for these events? If the findings are of the nature of "it happens in some and not in others," what were the characteristics of the cities and of the desegregation plans in those places where it

happened compared with those where it did not? Do the effects on housing have any effect upon (or correlate with) the success and/or effectiveness of school desegregation?

Methods

To gather the data for this component, sales records, census tract data and other records will have to be searched and segregation indices, etc. computed. It may be that the availability of these sorts of data will have to be another criterion considered in choosing the cities to be studied. Once the data are gathered, they can be coded, keypunched, and then analyzed using time series and OLS multiple regression. Studies of market values will have to be corrected for inflation and where there is no census tract data gathered between 1970 and 1980, special approaches to interpolation will have to be developed.

Who Would Do the Research?

Work proposed for this component of the field study cuts across two disciplines: economics and demography. The PI for this component could, thus, come from either discipline.

Media Content Analysis Component

Concern with the media expressed by the experts had two thrusts: 1) determining the extent to which the media influenced the success and effectiveness of school desegregation, and 2) discovering ways to influence the media. Both will be addressed by this component, but to get a clear answer to both questions, city selection and the interview data from the natural history component will have to be taken into account.

Purpose

The first purpose of this component is to content analyze media coverage of education, desegregation, and civil rights from before

desegregation, through the implementation phase, and into the present. A second purpose is to compare the coverage within cities with what school officials, editors, and others said they did vis-a-vis the media and to compare these linkages across cities. (This last comparison will be a qualitative one and not a statistical analysis.) A third purpose will be to compare within cities the changes in media coverage and changes in public support for desegregation and private education (to the extent that changes in support can be properly assessed).

Methods

The most important (and expensive) part of this component will be a quantitative content analysis of the nature of the media coverage given to school desegregation, public education, and any controversies while implementing desegregation. The term "media" has been used in most parts of this proposal, but it is probably true that only newspaper archives will be available for the analysis. If TV archives of local coverage are available, they can be analyzed in a similar fashion. For now, though, the discussion will concentrate on newspapers.

Rigorous, quantitative techniques have been developed for analyzing historical changes in the newspaper coverage of controversial subjects.[3] In brief, the technique involved developing a priori coding categories (e.g. "warns of violence") and units of analysis (e.g. the paragraph) and then quantifying on the basis of occurrence and/or number of column inches devoted to the category per unit of time. Two or more raters (not the same people who developed the categories) read random samples of newspaper coverage and code the material. When an acceptable level of reliability is reached by the coders (e.g. 90% agreement), then all or a large sample of the material is coded, quantified and keypunched. The data can then be

subjected to statistical analyses on the computer. In this way, it can be seen if newspaper coverage follows the same pattern or sequence of patterns in each city or if the pattern is different when someone from the school system claims to have influenced the media. It can also be seen if there is a correlation between the patterns of content and support for desegregation as expressed in the community survey component.

Who Would Do the Research?

No one discipline is clearly identified with this type of research. It was invented by a political scientist working for the OSS during World War II, but it has been used by psychologists, sociologists, and other social scientists since then. Hence, familiarity with the technique and with the subject matter is more important than the disciplinary base of the PI.

Student Quantitative Data

The data from this component are the cheapest (per bit) to gather and have the greatest potential for misuse or misinterpretation. They are intended to be used to answer the question "What happened to the students in the schools studied in the direct observation portion of the natural history component?" They are not intended to be used in a cross-city, comparative statistical analysis. As indicated in the discussion of the natural history component, the schools in which the direct observations are to take place will not be random or representative samples of schools in the school system of that city. The schools are to be chosen on the basis of a non-random theoretical decision (see above). Therefore, though one might compare the relationships obtained across cities (schools with good human relations programs had higher reading scores in all but two

cities), it is not appropriate to compare the average reading scores in schools across cities.

Methods

Students in the fifth grade and the tenth grade will serve as the subjects. The fifth grade was chosen because it is certain to be in an elementary school and fifth graders are about the youngest age group from which reliable answers to paper and pencil attitude questions can be obtained. Tenth graders were chosen because they are the oldest group possible before dropping out of school becomes a problem.

The students will be chosen on the basis of testing all or randomly selected English classes in the schools chosen for the direct observation part of the natural history component (see above).

The core of the tests will be the same in all cities, but some tests or items may be added in a given city in order to take advantage of existing data gathered by the school system or other researchers some years earlier. The basic measurements taken will include

1. Achievement tests (criterion referenced where possible)
    a. Reading
    b. Vocabulary
    c. Mathematics
    d. Ethnic history
2. "Attitude" scales
    a. Racial attitudes including stereotypes and old-fashioned and "modern" racial beliefs
    b. Self-concept including academic self-concept
    c. General political beliefs including tolerance for dissent and diversity

d. Perceptions of the school and its atmosphere, in particular, the character and rate of interracial contact

e. Aspirations

f. Perceptions of violence in school and who is to blame?

g. Participation in extra-curricular activities including evaluation of them

3. Student background

a. SES

b. Race

c. Other control data (see Table I).

Who Would Do the Research?

The testing and measurement and psychometric skills required for this component are usually the expertise of educational or social psychologists. They could design the scales and do the analyses. The data could be gathered by closely supervised graduate students from universities in the vicinity of the city being studied.

Community Opinion Data

The purpose for this component is to gather the data necessary to determine the attitudes and opinions of the broader community toward the schools and toward the desegregation process as it happened and as it continues. Though the data will be correlational, they can serve to give some estimate of what the media effects were in that city. Questions can be included with regard to housing, flight from public schools, perceptions of neighborhoods, and support for public education. And, of course, the public opinion data can serve as a validity check on what the elites tell the interviewers about public opinion in their city.

Methods

A random, telephone sample of about 600 people should be drawn in each city. In most urban areas today, over 95% of the households have telephones and research has shown that telephone surveys under these circumstances are superior to face-to-face interviewing. Telephone surveys are also a great deal less expensive. Phone numbers can be chosen at random from the telephone directory and then a random digit can be added to the last digit of the selected number. It is that number then that will be dialed. This technique (known as plus a random digit dialing) insures a random sample of households with telephones, circumvents the problem of unlisted numbers, insures the anonymity of the person being interviewed, and reduces the cost of dialing unassigned numbers or business numbers. Furthermore, by using a WATTS line, all of the interviews (across cities) can be conducted from the same location reducing the start-up costs associated with training interviewers and traveling to each location.

Because the sample size in each city is moderate, stratified samples may be used in order to insure that subsamples that the researchers regard as important will be large enough for meaningful analysis. Subsamples to consider could include some of the following:

1. Racial or ethnic groups
2. Parents of children presently in school
3. Parents of children in school at the time of desegregation
4. Parents who moved into the area after desegregation
5. Parents of private school students
6. Adults without children or without children of school age during the desegregation period
7. Adults who went through the desegregation process as students.

The topics or questions to be used in the interviews should include those listed below. Many of the questions about educational issues could be adopted from the Gallup Poll's annual survey on education. This would give the data a national comparison. If questions on these topics have been asked by local polls at earlier times (especially during or just before the years of implementation), the questions asked in this component should be adopted from them in order to give the survey a time dimension.

1. Perceptions and evaluation of the effectiveness of local schools
   a. System in general
   b. Specific schools, perhaps high schools
   c. Knowledge about and interaction with schools
2. Perceptions and evaluations of local housing markets and local neighborhoods
3. Opinions regarding local school desegregation
   a. the past
   b. the present
4. Perceptions of the school desegregation opinions of local lead-leaders
   a. School administrators and school board members
   b. Political leaders
   c. Publishers, editors, TV anchorpersons, TV channels, etc.
5. Racial attitudes including old fashioned and modern racism
6. Attitudes toward busing locally and generally across the nation
7. The subjects' perceptions of where they get their news about local and national school and school desegregation events

8. The usual political, sociological and demographic background (control) data.

Who Would Do the Research?

Public opinion polling is now taught in some graduate programs of political science, sociology, social psychology, and education. Furthermore, the actual sampling and interviewing could be subcontracted so that the PI for this component need not know the exact details of those skills. The PI, then, would be responsible for interview design and question wording, and subsequent data analysis and interpretation.

Time Sequencing

The detailed scheduling of the research will depend upon the composition of the research project team, but a general schedule would be as follows:

1. The PI's and board of overseers meet to lay out an agenda of criteria for selecting research sites and to draw up a preliminary list of 20 to 30 sites (time: two to three days)
2. The PI's (or their assistants) do preliminary research to determine which of the proposed sites meet which of the criteria e.g. availability of housing data, ethnic mix, attempts to influence media, etc. (12 weeks)
3. The PI's and board meet to finalize criteria and list of final 12 to 15 cities (3 days)
4. Field research (six months to one year depending upon component)
5. Data analysis and writing (six - nine months)
6. Preliminary report presented to and discussed with board (five days)
7. Final writing and editing (one month).

This schedule is highly speculative and is intended more as a guide to the sequence of events than as a time table.

Estimated Budget

Finally, we come to an estimate of the budget for the various components of the proposed field study. Though more detailed guesstimates underlie these figures, only the bottom line figures for each component will be given.

Board of overseers related expenses and preliminary data gathered (Consulting fees for board, travel expenses, etc.)	$ 75,000
Natural History Component (salaries, fees, travel, computer, etc.)	325,000
Housing Analysis	100,000
Media Content Analysis	100,000
Student Quantitative Data	100,000
Public Opinion Polling	275,000
Total	$ 975,000

Reference Notes

1. The decision to call the one successful and the other effective, really was arbitrary. The terms could have been interchanged with only slight changes in nuance and meaning.

2. The term "experts" is used throughout this paper as a shorthand expression for the more accurate, but exceedingly more awkward phrase "those sources and people consulted for this phase of the project including those involved in the literature review, synthesis and research agenda phases, the documents produced by these phases and the public officials who were interviewed."

3. See, for example, Johnson, P. B., Sears, D. O., & McConahay, J. B. Black invisibility, the press and the Los Angeles riots. American Journal of Sociology, 1971, 76, 698-721.